UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----X

Docket#

LIXANDER MORALES,

Plaintiff,

14-cv-00485-ARR-LB

- versus -

: U.S. Courthouse : Brooklyn, New Yo Brooklyn, New York

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

et al., : July 17, 2015 Defendants :

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE LOIS BLOOM UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

P P E A R A N C E S:

For the Plaintiff:

Pieter Van Tol, Esq. Andrew Leff, Esq. Hogan Lovells US LLP 875 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022

For the Defendant:

Joseph Anthony Marutollo, Esq. U.S. Attorney's Office Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201

Transcription Service:

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795 laferrara44@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

```
2
                            Proceedings
 1
              THE CLERK: Civil Cause for a Status
 2
   Conference, docket number 14-cv-485, Morales v. United
 3
   States of America, et al.
              Will the parties please state your names for
 4
 5
   the record?
 6
              MR. VAN TOL: Good morning, your Honor.
 7
              Pieter Van Tol from Hogan Lovells for the
 8
   plaintiff, Mr. Morales. I am joined by my colleague,
 9
   Andrew Leff, also from Hogan Lovells. I should note for
10
   the record that Mr. Leff is not yet admitted to this
11
   Court but it is -- he's working on it.
              THE COURT: It's imminent.
12
              MR. VAN TOL: It's imminent.
13
14
              THE COURT: Thank you.
15
              MR. MARUTOLLO: Good morning, your Honor.
16
              Joseph Marutollo for defendant United States of
17
   America and Dr. Dinesh Patel and with me is an intern
18
    from my office, Joshua Goldstein (ph.).
19
              THE CLERK: The Honorable Lois Bloom presiding.
20
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Van Tol, Mr.
21
   Leff, Mr. Marutollo and Mr. Goldstein. Happy Friday to
22
   everybody.
23
              MR. VAN TOL: Thank you, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: First I have to express my great
25
    full appreciation to Hogan Lovells and to you, Mr. Van
```

## Proceedings

Tol, for taking on this matter when we asked for pro bono counsel. We have looked over the case, as you saw. I did get counsel to retool the complaint but in order to get through what is essentially a medical care claim against the United States without counsel is virtually impossible. So we're very grateful that you have stepped forward to assist Mr. Morales, who I hope you've had the chance to meet with.

Mr. Marutollo, I never grant pro bono counsel unless I've had a number of conferences with a litigant. I am well aware, one, of the scarcity of the resources and two, that there are some cases that just should not take up that kind of resources but when somebody consistently tells the story, doesn't keep embellishing it with additional facts and quite frankly, there but for the grace of God, you know, anybody being incarcerated and having to have their teeth worked on, it has been something that you don't know this, Mr. Marutollo, because he's new in his office, but at the time that I got Mr. Morales' complaint, I got several other dental care cases regarding the same facility.

And that's not to say that I am jumping to any conclusion but you don't get to go out and shop for a dentist when you're in custody. You're given whoever you're given and here, you know, his claim is quite

### Proceedings

simply that during the extraction when the root broke which may be happens but the guy kept saying oh, this never happens, this never happens and continued to drill for an hour-and-a-half without taking an x-ray. That to me was something that I needed somebody other than the Court just to look into.

So, Mr. Marutollo, now that we have counsel on the other side, and even though Mr. Morales had said when we had spoken at a December 16th conference, that he wasn't interested in settlement, I'm hopeful that we can get through discovery and perhaps talk about how the case could be resolved.

And Mr. Van Tol, I don't know if you've had other federal tort claims act cases but -- have you?

MR. VAN TOL: I have not, your Honor, but people in my office are advising me. So I am well suited for that.

THE COURT: Well, the reason why I was going to say it is it is a malpractice case against -- it's a tort claim against the United States but there are some things that I am just going to put on the record. So when somebody names individuals like the case had been started when he brought it as a Bivens complaint, besides the Bivens complaint having a much higher standard which was deliberate indifference to serious medical need under the

# Proceedings

Eighth Amendment prescription against cruel and unusual harm, the biggest difference in my experience has been it's virtually impossible to get the government to settle a Bivens claim because they say that there has to be individual liability which Mr. Marutollo, I've met him because his supervisor brought him up when he was new and I know he comes from the City of New York, from the Corp. Counsel's office. The City has the same problem. When you name an officer, it's an individual being sued but it's the City that's going to pay.

Somehow the United States takes a very different position on it. They say oh, no, no, it's the individual, it's the individual. Well, I know the individual needs to be named but this is my long-winded way of saying that when you name the United States as an entity under a federal tort claims act, it comes out of a different pot.

The agency still has to resolve the case but somehow because it's not a Bivens claim against an individual, but it's a claim against the United States, even though it may still come out of the agency coffers, it's treated differently and it is something that I have had more success in getting federal tort claims act cases settled than getting Bivens claims settled. So --

MR. VAN TOL: Thank you, your Honor. That's

```
6
                            Proceedings
1
   very helpful. Thank you.
 2
              THE COURT: With that being said, we're sort of
 3
   starting -- Mr. Marutollo's taking over and Ms.
   Soloveichik is not coming back on this case. This is
 4
 5
   yours now?
 6
              MR. MARUTOLLO: That's correct, your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Great. I'm glad to hear that.
 8
   Nothing against her, just that I want to make sure that I
 9
   have the people who are going to be working together on
10
   the case.
11
              And, Mr. Leff, you're new to the firm?
              MR. LEFF: Yes, I've been at the firm only a
12
13
   few months.
14
              THE COURT: Is that because you just graduated?
15
              MR. LEFF: Yes, I did last May.
16
              THE COURT: Because you look like you're
17
    fifteen, I'm so sorry to say that.
18
              MR. LEFF: I've gotten that before.
19
              THE COURT: I'm sure I'm not the only one that
20
   said that to you.
21
              MR. LEFF: No, your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: Well, congratulations on your
23
   graduation.
24
              MR. LEFF: Thank you.
25
              THE COURT: And on landing at a good place.
```

# Proceedings

And I'm glad that you're coming in right away because that's the way to learn.

Okay. So I had set the deadline to complete fact discovery back in December but, of course, I had to stay discovery and extended it to July and August ut we know that that's not going to work.

So have the parties talked to each other about discovery and do you have proposals for what would be realistic?

MR. VAN TOL: Yes, your Honor. We have done -we have conferred and we have come up with a schedule
which I hope is realistic. Of course it's at the Court's
discretion but what we were hoping for is a fact
discovery deadline of mid-December, 2015 and I believe th
other two deadlines were expert disclosure and then
expert depositions and those would be thirty days after
that under our proposal, so mid-January 2016 for the
disclosure and mid-February 2016 for the depositions.

I know a plaintiff, I should move the case forward and I would like to. We're gathering the documents. I think that's a doable schedule and we would like to adhere to it.

THE COURT: Well, that sounds good to me. The only thing that I would say in between is before you start investing -- now, usually the government is going

# Proceedings

to want -- I don't know whether they're going to want to do an exam of plaintiff under Rule 35 or they're just going to want their expert to review his records. Have we gathered the records, Mr. Marutollo?

MR. MARUTOLLO: We've gathered some of the records. Some document requests prior to counsel's involvement in the case have been outstanding and there were also some issues which we've raised with counsel and seem like that they will be resolved in terms of the execution of the releases and we were unable to get some of the records because the releases were incomplete when the plaintiff was appearing pro se.

So I think we do not have all of the records is the short answer to the question but additionally, I think in this case prior to any potential settlement conference, we may want to have either the plaintiff's deposition or an independent medical examination --

THE COURT: Or both perhaps.

MR. MARUTOLLO: -- or both perhaps.

THE COURT: Well, this is what I want to say.

Because Hogan Lovells has taken on the case, that doesn't mean that it's not a pro bono case. So we want to try to conserve resources so that they'll take other cases in the future.

Toward that end, Mr. Van Tol, there is

# Proceedings

9

something called the Eastern District Civil Litigation 1 2 You can find it on the web site of the Court and 3 the rules are that you can get reimbursement but you have to request before you expend that funds for 4 5 reimbursement. And quite frankly, even though it doesn't 6 say it, since I'm a liaison to that board, they don't pay 7 in any one case more than like \$5,000. So even if you need an expert, but that will help defray the cost. Some 8 firms, quite frankly, don't ever come to the fund because 9 10 that's not part of their issue. They'll foot their own 11 bill. Other firms in order -- my reason for raising this 12 to you is I would like your firm to want to take cases 13 here and if that is in any way going to be the problem, I 14 want you to know that there is this reimbursement fund. 15 You make the application. It can take care of deposition 16 transcripts and court reporters. It can take care of 17 anything that would be paid for in a Criminal Justice Act 18 case, can be paid for with the exception that it only 19 goes to a certain limit. Okay? 20

MR. VAN TOL: Thank you, your Honor.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So, the reason why I said that is I do know that the government may need either an exam or a deposition or both or may need the expert that they are going to designate to review the records to see whether or not it was an actionable tort to keep drilling.

```
10
                            Proceedings
 1
   don't know. It makes my teeth hurt just thinking about
 2
   it though. So that's sort of my threshold, Mr.
 3
   Marutollo. If my teeth are hurting when I am reading the
   complaint, you know --
 4
 5
              So I'm sorry, I'm not trying to make light of
 6
   it but --
 7
              MR. MARUTOLLO: That's okay.
 8
              THE COURT: -- you understand. So in any
   event, I'll adopt the dates that you have proposed to the
 9
10
   Court. They seem reasonable. I do want the parties to
11
   work together. I have no doubt that you'll be able to
12
   get a lot more accomplished now that Mr. Van Tol is on it
    and you're on it, Mr. Marutollo.
13
14
              So, you're asking for mid-December. So let's
15
   say December 18th -- no, that's a Saturday. Wait. No,
16
    that's a Friday. December 18th to complete all
17
    discovery, 12/18/15 and then expert discovery, I am going
18
   to give you a little bit more than I usually would
19
   because I do want there to be time in between that
20
   perhaps we could meet and talk settlement.
21
              So, January 31st for the expert reports and
22
   then the end of February is -- February 28th -- 2/28/16.
   So I'll adopt all of those and then Judge Ross has her
23
24
    own pre-motion conference rules. So thirty days from the
25
   close of expert would put us to March 28th. And I'll put
```

Proceedings

this all in a record that you'll get by ECF.

But my hope is that you'll get through the fact discovery and you'll want to come to the table to talk about a way to resolve the case. One big difference in federal prisoners who are bringing civil rights claims or a federal torts claims act is if it's a state prisoner or a city prisoner, they have a big carrot and stick in the attorney's fee provision, which is 1988. Unfortunately, in federal prisoners claims, there is no corresponding statute.

Since Bivens was a creation of the Supreme

Court as an analog to the mechanism under 42 U.S.C.

Section 1983, and 1988 was passed at the same time as

1983, but there's never been any analog under Bivens. So

that is usually a -- this is all grist for the mill for

future reference. Mr. Van Tol, that's usually a way that

we can get City cases to resolve because when Hogan

Lovells comes in on a City case, they don't want your

attorney fee application at the end of the case. So they

would rather settle with the plaintiff than to face your

bill.

But in a federal case, we don't have that same carrot and stick or at least nobody has ever pointed me to any case where the -- under the Bivens remedy the Court has given attorneys fees. So the United States

```
12
                            Proceedings
 1
   Attorney's Office knows that. They use that.
 2
   doesn't mean that we can't get cases resolved. So if
 3
   when you're doing the research it looks like this is a
   case that should be resolved, I welcome you calling my
 4
 5
    chambers and getting a settlement conference.
 6
              Is Mr. Morales still incarcerated?
 7
              MR. VAN TOL: He is, your Honor. Yes.
              THE COURT: And where is he?
 8
              MR. VAN TOL: At the Queens Detention Facility.
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. At least he's local, so if
10
11
   we needed him, it wouldn't be that difficult. So I'll
   set the deadlines that we've discussed on the record for
12
    fact discovery, expert reports and expert depositions and
13
14
   the pre-motion conference.
15
              Were there any other matters that needed to be
16
   addressed today on behalf of Mr. Morales, Mr. Van Tol?
17
              MR. VAN TOL: No, your Honor. Thank you very
18
   much.
19
              THE COURT: Thank you. Anything further, Mr.
20
   Marutollo --
21
              MR. MARUTOLLO: No, your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: -- on behalf of the United States?
23
              Then, thank you very much. I will leave it in
24
   your good hands and please contact my chambers if I could
25
   be helpful. Thank you.
```

```
13
                              Proceedings
               MR. MARUTOLLO: Thank you, your Honor.
 1
 2
               MR. VAN TOL: Thank you.
 3
               MR. MARUTOLLO: Have a good weekend.
 4
               THE COURT: You, too.
 5
                     (Matter concluded)
                           -000-
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

#### CERTIFICATE

I, LINDA FERRARA, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this 4th day of November, 2015.

Linda Ferrara

CET\*\*D 656

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.